

## Summary Minutes

### Infill and Revitalization Steering Committee

City Hall- Pikes Peak Room (107 N. Nevada Ave., Colorado Springs)

Tuesday March 17, 2015

1:30 p.m.

Members Attending: Gaebler, Pico, Donley, Beck, Gibson, Harris, Day, Nelson, Nicklasson, Bishop, Shonkwiler

Members Absent: Craddock, Bishop, Seibert

Staff Present: Wysocki, Schueler, Nunez, Schubloom, Bingman, Tefertiller, Geitner, Gudotti

Guests: Rick Hoover, CONO: Marla Novak (HBA); Rich Kramer (UPAC Chair); Bill Cherrier (CSU CFO); David Grossman-CSU); Dave Munger CONO

#### Call to Order/ Adjustments to Agenda

Ms. Gaebler called the meeting to order. There were no changes to the agenda.

#### Overview of Schedule and Process to Date

Carl Schueler presented a brief PowerPoint summarizing remaining topics and tasks, interim/ ongoing initiatives, suggested components of the Chapter and remaining schedule considerations.

Jill Gaebler summarized recent meetings and State legislative status concerning the construction defect issue, noting this issue impacts a sector of the housing market (owned units with common walls) that is particularly important to infill.

Peter Wysocki, briefed the Committee on his discussions with peer Colorado planning directors while he attended the Rocky Mountain Land Use Conference. Most other peer municipalities do not have as “subjective” standards (i.e. “harmonious and compatible”) for uses otherwise allowed by right. However, most communities have more detailed objective zoning development standards and many have more up-to-date neighborhood plans. Substantial discussion ensued, and carried forward into the next agenda items.

## Committee Open Discussion

*(note: discussion and comments not necessarily listed in the order they came during the meeting)*

Discussion followed under this agenda item. Robert Shonkwiler stated his position in favor of reliance by the property owner based on zoning use by right coupled with objective and certain standards pertaining to requirements like, parking, buffers and landscaping. Rachel Beck stated a need for a trade-off in the form of additional and more definitive objective standards based on neighborhood planning, in exchange for allowance of use by right in all cases. Ms. Day agreed. Discussion continued regarding zoning approaches, including real and hypothetical examples. Mr. Shonkwiler suggested additional zone districts could be created to better match planning objectives of neighborhoods and the City. Carl Schueler, responded that some national expert recommend a simplification of zoning categories with more land use flexibility in most districts.

Mr. Wysocki also stressed that it is important to remain cognizant that zoning and the development review process is only one factor impacting development and redevelopment, and ordinarily not the most factor. As an example, he noted that the City of Austin has a reputation for being difficult and inefficient in its land development review process, while at the same time experiencing high levels of levels of development activity including redevelopment.

Aubrey Day stressed the importance of ‘complimentary conversations’ that will need to occur in conjunction with other topics and initiatives (e.g. on economic development policy) since there will needs to be integration across plans and disciplines.

Sarah Harris suggested the importance of also addressing the “public realm” in addition to use of private property. It was noted this topic ‘mature area maintenance’ is slated for a future meeting.

Eddie Bishop noted it will be important to address the topic of “density” as this pertains to infill. Oftentimes the concerns are most about density compared with other factors including use.

Andy Pico commented that County enclaves can be an issue in part because these areas often have lower density and sometimes transitional uses. He also noted the challenge with matching up with low density residential uses on the City’s periphery.

## FBZ and Zoning Recommendations

Under this topic there was additional discussion centered on the importance of having neighborhood plans (Ms. Nicklasson and others). There was broad concurrence. However, Robert Shonkwiler suggested that it will be important not use the absence of up-to-date as an excuse for delaying actions and decisions concerning infill and redevelopment.

Dave Munger suggested the 13 “super neighborhoods” identified as part of the Streetscapes Solutions Team process could have some value for this process. Mr. Wysocki observed that in some cases there can be difference in the perspectives of immediately adjacent neighbors versus the larger neighborhood and what larger neighborhood plan might say.

Ryan Tefertiller and others noted that Downtown FBZ acts to some degree as neighborhood plan- in conjunction with the Imagine Downtown Plan.

Robert Shonkwiler and Eddie Bishop noted the “scale problem” associated with a developer having to do hire a planner to do extensive planning work for a small site (i.e. and extensive public process and/or detailed and customized PUD zoning plans). With larger sites, these costs of doing business can be distributed across more units or square footage. Ms. Nicklasson agreed that for small sites it is important to have a structure in place that generally lets everyone know what is allowed/ not allowed and what the requirements are.

Mr. Shonkwiler also suggested the notion of ‘negative zoning’ or listing those uses or densities not allowed for a certain studied area. He further suggests additional zoning districts might be needed to implement this system. Carl Schueler responded that there is a national push to reduce the number and complexity of zone districts and (except for low density residential and heavy industrial districts) generally accommodate a greater mix of uses and densities in the districts cities do have. The current draft Committee recommendations include direction to consider more permitted flexibility in the City’s non-residential districts.

### Utilities Recommendations

The need to discuss and comment on the draft Utilities recommendations was noted. It was agreed that members should provide comments to Carl Schueler prior to the next meeting. He will compile any recommended changes.

Brent Schubloom reminded the Committee that there is group working on the downtown alley/easement topic.

Elena Nunez commented that the Committee should make sure its focus extend beyond the Downtown area.

### Code Enforcement Item for Next Meeting

The Committee agreed that the presentation on this item on April 6<sup>th</sup> should begin with a briefing by Tom Wasinger, Manager of City Code Enforcement and also include input from CONO as well as Curtis Olson of “Blight to Bright”.

### Other Updates and Announcements

The Community Viz meeting on 3/4/15 was briefly reported on

- i. Workshop Date April 23, 2015

The UPAC process is continuing.

### Next Steps and Meetings

The next meeting will be Monday, April 6, 2015, 1:30 p.m.

This meeting will be devoted primarily to the Code Enforcement topic as well as feedback on and potential changes to the preliminary utilities recommendations.

Carl to provide minutes, large area neighborhood map and Utilities recommendations to Committee. Committee to return comments on recommendations to Carl.